UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,403	09/30/2000	CARL A. EDLUND	1018.125US1	6921

45809 7590 08/17/2005

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER	
STORK, KYLE R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/677,403	EDLUND ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 28-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 28-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the request for continued examination filed 27 June 2005.

2. Claims 1-16 and 28-32 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 28 are independent claims. Claims 30-32 are newly added claims. The rejection of claims 1-16 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 9-14 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the layout behavior" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the comparable behavior" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the rendering behavior" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 10 and 13-14 are rejected based upon their dependence upon a rejected base claim.

5. The term "any degree" in claims 30-32 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "any degree" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. "Any degree" fails to specify how much the behaviors must participate together.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 28, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stone et al. (US 6101510, filed 29 January 1997, hereafter Stone).

As per independent claim 1, Stone discloses a system comprising:

- A markup language core engine for providing categories of behaviors including layout and rendering behaviors (column 16, lines 64-67: Here, the HTML viewer parsers categories of behaviors, including layout and rending behaviors, in order to display the HTML within the browser control frame)
- At least one external component designed to provide categories of external component behaviors including at least one of an external component layout

behavior and an external component rendering behavior in addition to the behaviors provided by the core engine (column 3, lines 23-38 and column 4, lines 23-29: Here, the browser control interface is implemented external to the browser (at the server). This interface further has the ability to add additional content or script code to an HTML page to change the appearance (rendering/layout) of the HTML page within the browser)

- A pair of interfaces associated with each external component for communication between the external component and the core engine (column 3, lines 23-38; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6: Here, in addition to the browser control interface, an object interface is used to access an object's data through function calls)
- A mechanism included in the core engine to extend a selected category of behavior of the core engine with the behaviors of a same category of the at least one external component (column 2, lines 53-63), such that the behaviors of the same category of the at least one external component participate with the behaviors of the core engine, wherein the mechanism and the at least one external component communicate through the pair of interfaces to confirm participation, and participation includes at least one external component delegating some processing of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine (column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29; column 6, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 10-23; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6; column 13, lines 47-51: Here, the browser interface and the document interface (the pair of interfaces)

interact between the external component (the server) using DDE to extend the core engine. The processing is delegated between the core and external components through the browser control interface).

As per independent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claims 28 is similarly rejected under Stone.

As per dependent claim 30, Stone discloses the system wherein external component behaviors can participate with the core engine behaviors of the same category to any degree (column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29; column 6, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 10-23; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6; column 13, lines 47-51: Here, the browser interface and the document interface (the pair of interfaces) interact between the external component (the server) using DDE to extend the core engine. The processing is delegated between the core and external components through the browser control interface).

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 30. Claim 32 is similarly rejected under Stone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, 15-16, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone and further in view of Weis et al. (US 6161126, filed 2 February 2002, hereafter Wies).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Stone discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone fails to specifically disclose a first interface of each pair is exposed by the external component for querying by the mechanism and a second interface of each pair is exposed by the mechanism for querying by the external component. However, Wies discloses wherein a first interface of each pair is exposed by the external component for querying by the mechanism (Wies Abstract Line 4 Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 22 Lines 55-57), and a second interface of each pair is exposed by the mechanism for querying by the external component (Wies Abstract Line 4 Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 22 Lines 55-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to allow a user to interact with the system via a mouse (Wies: column 23, lines 32-57).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Stone discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component override comparable behaviors of the core engine. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-

63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine) override comparable behaviors of the core engine (Wies Col 18 Lines 60 i.e. override Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 2 browser engine).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

As per independent claim 7, Stone discloses a method performed by a mechanism for extending a behavior of a core engine with a behavior of an external component, both the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belonging to a same category of behavior, the category being one of a layout behavior and a rendering behavior, the method comprising:

- Calling a behavior initialization method of the external component to determine how the behavior of the external component participates with the behavior of the core engine (column 2, lines 53-63), wherein the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belong to the same category of behavior and participation includes supplementing core engine behavior with external component behavior, wherein supplementing includes the at least one external component delegating some processing of the core engine behavior and the external component behavior, belonging to the same category of behavior, to the core engine in one mode (column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29; column 6,

lines 1-6; column 8, lines 10-23; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6; column 13, lines 47-51: Here, the browser interface and the document interface (the pair of interfaces) interact between the external component (the server) using DDE to extend the core engine. The processing is delegated between the core and external components through the browser control interface)

- Calling a behavior method of he external component for the external component to provide the behavior of the external component when the core engine is providing the behavior of the core, so that the behavior of the external component participates with the behavior of the core engine (column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29; column 6, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 10-23; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6; column 13, lines 47-51)
- Receiving a call to corresponding behavior method of the mechanism for the external component to communicate with the core engine during participation of the behavior of the external component with the behavior of the core engine column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29; column 6, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 10-23; column 10, line 59- column 11, line 6; column 13, lines 47-51)

Stone fails to specifically disclose participation includes replacing core engine behavior with external component behavior in another mode. However, Wies discloses replacing core engine behavior with external component behavior in another mode (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine; Wies Col 18 Lines 60 i.e. override Wies Col 3

Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 2 browser engine).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 8 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 9, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 9 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 10, Stone and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone further discloses the method wherein the behavior is fully delegated to the external component from the core engine, which is specified by the external component in response to calling the behavior initialization method of the external component (column 3, line 23-38; column 4, lines 23-29).

As per dependent claim 12, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 12 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 13 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 15, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 16, Stone and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone further discloses a computer program from a computer readable medium (column4, lines 52-57).

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 29 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 30. Claim 31 is similarly rejected.

10. Claims 4-6, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone and Wies and in further view of Ramaley et al. (US 6585777, filed 19 June 1999, herein after Ramaley.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Stone discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component of the core engine. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component of the core engine (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 6 Lines 1-5 i.e. similar Col 23 Line 2 browser engine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Stone and Wies do not specifically mention comparable behaviors. However, Ramaley mentions comparing files (Ramaley Col 12 Lines 31-36). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Stone and Wies, providing the benefit of a comparison operation to determine whether support files identified by the prior file list are no longer identified by the current file list as taught by Ramaley Col 13 Lines 30-36.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Stone discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Stone and Wies do not specifically mention behaviors that are attached and can be applied and then removed. However, Ramaley mentions attached behaviors that can be applied and removed (Ramaley Col 9 Lines 28 i.e. connected Col 5 Lines 50-53 i.e. embedded and Col 5 Lines 54 i.e. removed). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Wies, providing the benefit of a file embedded within a primary file that is detected and a

location removed for the file to represent the embedded file as taught by Ramaley Col 5 Line 50-55.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Stone discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Stone fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component are element behaviors. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component are element behaviors (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Stone and Wies do not specifically mention behaviors that are applied. However, Ramaley mentions behaviors that are applied (Ramaley Col 9 Lines 28 i.e. connected). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Wies, providing the benefit of connecting to having an exemplary operating environment.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Stone and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Wies further discloses wherein the behavior implemented by the external component is called after the ... of the core engine is performed (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client

machine Col 23 Line 2 browser engine) which is specified by the external component in response to calling the behavior ... of the external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine Col 23 Line 2 browser engine)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Stone's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Stone and Wies do not specifically mention comparable behaviors. However, Ramaley mentions comparing files (Ramaley Col 12 Lines 31-36). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Stone and Wies, providing the benefit of a comparison operation to determine whether support files identified by the prior file list are no longer identified by the current file list as taught by Ramaley Col 13 Lines 30-36.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 14 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims1-16 and 28-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As disclosed above, the Stone reference has been added to address the amended subject matter.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bateman ("Features of the Novell Kernel Services Programming Environment for NLMs: Part Two"): Discloses process threading.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER